

On appeal, Plaintiff contends that the ALJ's decision is inconsistent and not supported by

substantial evidence. Plaintiff's brief contains no support whatever for the contention that the ALJ's decision is inconsistent. Plaintiff's brief also contains no discussion of the ALJ's determination at step five that, while Plaintiff was unable to perform his past work as a carpenter, there are other jobs existing in significant numbers in the national economy which the claimant can perform, consistent with his medical impairments, age, education, past work experience, and residual functional capacity. Plaintiff's brief simply asserts that Plaintiff was unable to perform his past relevant work as a carpenter as of his date last insured. There is no dispute on that point; the ALJ arrived at the same conclusion.

The only further point that Plaintiff's brief makes is that, subsequent to the date last insured, there were significant medical complications. This has no relevance to the issues that were before the ALJ.

Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that the ALJ's decision is not supported by substantial evidence. This Court finds that the ALJ's determination is supported by substantial evidence. The decision of the Commissioner that Plaintiff was not disabled within the meaning of the Act is affirmed.

s/ Stanley R. Chesler
STANLEY R. CHESLER, U.S.D.J.

Dated: September 1, 2011